REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. Claims 1, 10-15, 17, 26-31, 33-35 and 42-44 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 10-15, 17, 26-31, 33-35 and 42-44 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santo et al. (US 6,587,284) (hereinafter "Santo") in view of Kasuga et al. (US 5,844,881) (hereinafter "Kasuga").

Claims 1 and 10-15

Claim recites: "...wherein a position of a neutral zone between the first and third magnet parts, a position of a neutral zone between the second and fourth magnet parts, and a magnetic flux intensity distribution having an asymmetric shape along a focusing direction are changeable in order to optimize a tracking sensitivity..." The Office Action relies on Kasuga to show this feature of claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action relies on Figure 9 of Kasuga and the accompanying text.

Kasuga discusses that the designed position of magnetization of the focusing magnet section 6a in the focusing direction may be shifted upwardly in the direction of the shaft as much as the amount of sink z of the lens holder 1 measured from the designed neutral point, which is indicated by the dotted lines in Figure 9 of Kasuga. However, Kasuga does not discuss that a position of a neutral zone between the second and fourth magnet parts, and a magnetic flux intensity distribution having an asymmetric shape along a focusing direction are changeable in order to optimize a tracking sensitivity as is recited in claim 1. Specifically, Kasuga only discusses changing the designed position of magnetizations for one focusing magnet section 6a rather than in separate magnet sections as recited in claim 1.

This technical feature of claim 1 where the center of driving of the magnetic circuit can be easily changed to be positioned upwardly or downwardly by selectively using the magnetic circuits according to aspects of the present invention makes it possible to manufacture an optical pickup actuator that reduces rolling by appropriately selecting the magnetic circuits considering overall conditions of the optical pickup actuator.

Claims 10-15 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 17, 26-31, 33 and 34

Claim 17 recites: "...wherein a position of a neutral zone between the first and third magnet parts, a position of a neutral zone between the second and fourth magnet parts, and a magnetic flux intensity distribution having an asymmetric shape along a focusing direction are changeable in order to optimize a tracking sensitivity..." The Office Action relies on Kasuga to show this feature of claim 17. Specifically, the Office Action relies on Figure 9 of Kasuga and the accompanying text. However, it is respectfully submitted that Kasuga does not discuss that a position of a neutral zone between the second and fourth magnet parts, and a magnetic flux intensity distribution having an asymmetric shape along a focusing direction are changeable in order to optimize a tracking sensitivity as is recited in claim 17. Specifically, Kasuga only discusses changing the designed position of magnetizations for one focusing magnet section 6a rather than in separate magnet sections as recited in claim 17.

Claims 26-31, 33 and 34 depend on claim 17 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 35 and 42-44,

Claim 35 recites: "...wherein a position of a neutral zone between the first and third magnet parts, a position of a neutral zone between the second and fourth magnet parts, and a magnetic flux intensity distribution having an asymmetric shape along a focusing direction are changeable in order to optimize a tracking sensitivity..." The Office Action relies on Kasuga to show this feature of claim 35. Specifically, the Office Action relies on Figure 9 of Kasuga and the accompanying text. However, it is respectfully submitted that Kasuga does not discuss that a position of a neutral zone between the second and fourth magnet parts, and a magnetic flux intensity distribution having an asymmetric shape along a focusing direction are changeable in order to optimize a tracking sensitivity as is recited in claim 35. Specifically, Kasuga only discusses changing the designed position of magnetizations for one focusing magnet section 6a rather than in separate magnet sections as recited in claim 35.

Claims 42-44 depend on claim 35 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 8, 2007

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501